

Serial No. 10/500,204

Attorney Docket No. PD010078

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-4 and 13 remain pending in this application with claim 12 being cancelled and claims 1-3 and 13 being amended by this response. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the present invention evaluates data types of each of at least two data items of different data type received in a data file. Support for this amendment can be found through the specification and more specifically on page 6, line 16 - page 8, line 6. Claim 1 has further been amended to clarify that the at least two data items are either of an essence data type being defined to be either data which is interpretable by a device as a link pointing to reference data but with no data referring to said link, or data which the device is unable to interpret as a link, a metadata type being defined as data interpretable by the device as a link pointing to reference data and any essence data referring to the link or of a container data type containing at least an essence data item and a different data item.

Claim 1 had been amended even further to clarify that the present invention evaluates, for each of the at least two data items, whether the device is able to interpret the respective essence data for reproducing a physical representation of the linked reference data or the data not interpretable as a link being said respective essence data. This is done, so as to indicate that the corresponding data item is either of a physical data type, if the device is able to interpret the respective essence data, or of an abstract data type, otherwise. Support for these amendments can be found throughout the specification and more specifically on page 7, line 1 - page 8, line 6. Claims 2, 3 and 13 have been amended accordingly. Additionally, claims 1 and 13 have been amended to correct typographical errors. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added by these amendments.

Rejection of Claims 1-4, 9, 12-13 under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 1-4, and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guck (U.S. Patent No. 5,864,870) in view of Esquibel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,662,186). Claim 12 has been cancelled by this response.

Serial No. 10/500,204

Attorney Docket No. PD010078

The present claimed invention provides a method for detection of data types for data type dependent processing. The method includes receiving a data file and analyzing the received data file to determine whether the format of the received data file can be detected. After detecting the format of the received data file, using the detected format for evaluating a data type of each of at least two data items of different data type, wherein the at least two data items are comprised in the received data file and are either of: an essence data type being defined to be either data which is interpretable by a device as a link pointing to reference data but with no data referring to the link or data which the device is unable to interpret as a link; a metadata subtype being defined as data interpretable by the device as a link pointing to reference data and any essence data referring to the link; or of a container data type containing at least an essence data item and another data item of any data type. Each of the at least two data items are then evaluated as to whether the device is able to interpret the respective essence data for reproducing a physical representation of the data not interpretable as a link or the linked reference data being the respective essence data so as to indicate that the corresponding data item is either of a physical data type, if the device is able to interpret the respective essence data, or of an abstract data type. The result of the evaluations is then supplied to the device for data type dependent processing of each of the at least two data items. Claim 1 contains features similar to those discussed above.

Classification of data items comprised in a data file according to device specific data types allow for sorting, storing and/or searching the content of the data file in an efficient way (Page 10, lines 12-14). For example, different data types like images, text, images with a link and the like can be referenced in and/or separated from an html-file within which they are contained. This allows for accelerated searches for references between documents or images. In addition, storage capacity may be saved by storing data items of the same type together which enables data type specific compression to be applied.

Serial No. 10/500,204

Attorney Docket No. PD010078

Guck describes a method in a server for storing and retrieving files of various formats in an object database coupled to a network including a multiplicity of clients also coupled to the network. The server includes a storage device for storing objects of the database. The method begins by determining the type and content of files received by the server from the clients coupled. Each file received by the server is transformed into an object. The transformed objects are stored in a hierarchy in accordance with the type and content thereof. The retrieving part of the process includes transmitting a "get" request to the server; searching a Virtual File class for an object whose name matches the file name; and examining corresponding properties of the matching object for compatibility with the first parameter. If compatible, a next parameter is examined for corresponding properties for compatibility. When all parameters have been examined, the content is enveloped and returned to the client that originated the "get" request. (See Abstract)

The Office Action on page 1 asserts that Guck discloses evaluating a data type as in the present claimed invention. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Specifically, the server of Guck transforms each file received into an object which is stored in a hierarchy in accordance with the type and the content thereof (Guck, Abstract). The data objects represent a multi-part category (Guck, col. 8, l. 1-3). Each data object is then transformed as a whole into one of four subtype objects dependent on whether the body parts are semantically and/or syntactically identical (Guck, fig. 4B and col. 9, l. 9-24). Essentially, Guck describes **collectively processing** parts of the same file dependent upon the **interrelationship of the parts**. This is wholly unlike the present claimed invention, which evaluates the data type of **each** of two or more data items in a single file. The claimed evaluation evaluates whether each respective data item comprises data being a link and/or data not being a link. Thus, Guck is fundamentally different than the present claimed invention, as Guck is concerned with the evaluating the parts of a multi-part object **together**, by comparing semantics and syntax of their contents and the present claimed invention is concerned with evaluating the multiple parts of a data file **independently**, to determine whether the data represents a link. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Guck neither discloses nor suggests "after detecting the format of the received data file, using said detected format for evaluating

Serial No. 10/500,204

Attorney Docket No. PD010078

a data type of each of at least two data items of different data type” as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

In addition, as admitted by the Examiner in the Office Action, Guck does not disclose evaluating whether the device is able to interpret the essence data to indicate whether the data is of a physical data type or an abstract data type. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Guck neither discloses nor suggests “evaluating for each of the at least two data items whether the device is able to interpret the respective essence data for reproducing a physical representation of the data not interpretable as a link or the linked reference data being said respective essence data so as to indicate that the corresponding data item is either of a physical data type, if the device is able to interpret the respective essence data, or of an abstract data type” as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

Accordingly, as Guck is not concerned with evaluating each part of a data item separately or evaluating whether the device is able to interpret the essence data, Guck is not concerned with supplying the results of the evaluations to the device for data type dependent processing. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Guck neither discloses nor suggests “supplying the result of said evaluations to the device for data type dependent processing of each of said at least two data items” as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

Esquibel et al. describes a system and method for propagating data from one file format to another file format and analyzing the file format of saved data to determine whether the file can be opened by the requesting application program. If the file is of a format or version different than that of the requesting application program, the data propagation logic analyzes the file to determine the available file formats attached thereto and launches an executable module, either attached to the file or remotely accessible via a resource indicator, to convert the file to a new file of a format and/or version readable by the requesting application program (Abstract).

Serial No. 10/500,204

Attorney Docket No. PD010078

The Office Action asserts that Esquibel et al. disclose evaluating whether the device can interpret the essence data to reproduce a physical representation as in the present claimed invention. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Esquibel et al. teaches propagating data from one file format to another format by converting a file to a new format readable by a requesting application program (Esquibel, Abstract). Specifically, a file format is specific to the type of data the file comprises (col. 1, lines 14-16). Accordingly, file formats are added as file extensions to saved documents to identify the type of saved data (col. 1, lines 18-30). These extensions can be used to analyze and interpret the file and determine the associated format (col. 4, lines 41-43). Essentially, Esquibel et al. teaches only a **single data type per file**. Esquibel et al. are not at all concerned with data items within a file but instead are solely concerned with the type of the file. This is wholly unlike the present claimed invention, which evaluates the data type of **each of at least two data items within a data file**. Thus, Esquibel et al. are fundamentally different than the present claimed invention, as Esquibel et al. are concerned with a **single data type per file and evaluation of files in their entirety** and the present claimed invention is concerned with **multiple data types per file and evaluation of files by parts**. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Esquibel et al., similar to Guck, neither disclose nor suggest "after detecting the format of the received data file, using said detected format for evaluating a data type of **each of at least two data items** of different data type" as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

Accordingly, as Esquibel et al. are not concerned with evaluating the data type of multiple data parts within a file, Esquibel et al. are not concerned with evaluating the interpretability of the essence data of **multiple data items of the data file**. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Esquibel et al., similar to Guck, neither disclose nor suggest "evaluating for each of the at least two data items whether the device is able to interpret the **respective** essence data for reproducing a physical representation of the data not interpretable as a link or the linked reference data being said respective essence data so as to indicate that the corresponding **data item** is either of a physical data type, if the device is able to interpret the respective essence data, or of an abstract data type" as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

Serial No. 10/500,204

Attorney Docket No. PD010078

Furthermore, as Esquibel et al. are not concerned with evaluating each part of a data item separately or evaluating whether the device is able to interpret the essence data, Esquibel et al. are not concerned with supplying the results of the evaluations to the device for data type dependent processing. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Esquibel et al., similar to Guck, neither discloses nor suggests "supplying the result of said evaluations to the device for data type dependent processing of each of said at least two data items" as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

The Office Action asserts further that the combination of the systems of Guck and Esquibel et al. disclose the principles of the present claimed invention. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. As described above, both Guck and Esquibel et al. neither disclose nor suggest this feature. Furthermore, if one were to combine the systems of Guck and Esquibel et al., the combined system merely **collectively evaluates the interrelationship of data parts** of a data file and evaluates the format using the file extension. This is wholly unlike the present claimed invention, which **individually** evaluates the data type of each of at least two data items comprised in a single file. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the combination, similar to the individual systems of Guck and Esquibel et al., neither discloses nor suggests "after detecting the format of the received data file, using said detected format for evaluating a data type of each of at least two data items of different data type" as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

Additionally, the present claimed evaluation evaluates the at least two data items with respect to whether they comprise data interpretable by the device as a link and their interpretability by the device for creating a physical representation. As described above, both Guck and Esquibel et al. neither disclose nor suggest this feature. Additionally, the combined system collectively evaluates the interrelationship of data parts of a data file and **evaluates the format using the file extension**. This is wholly unlike the present claimed invention, which evaluates the **interpretability of each data item**. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the combination, similar to the individual systems of Guck and Esquibel et al., neither discloses nor suggests "evaluating for each of the at least two data items whether the device is able to interpret

Serial No. 10/500,204

Attorney Docket No. PD010078

the **respective** essence data for reproducing a physical representation of the data not interpretable as a link or the linked reference data being said respective essence data so as to indicate that the corresponding **data item** is either of a physical data type, if the device is able to interpret the respective essence data, or of an abstract data type” as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

Accordingly, as the combination is not concerned with evaluating each part of a data item separately or evaluating whether the device is able to interpret the essence data, the combination is not concerned with supplying the results of the evaluations to the device for data type dependent processing as in the present claimed invention. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the combination, similar to the individual systems of Guck and Esquibel et al., neither discloses nor suggests “supplying the result of said evaluations to the device for data type dependent processing of each of said at least two data items” as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

In view of the above remarks it is respectfully submitted that there is no 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure in Guck and Esquibel et al., when taken alone or in combination, that makes the present claim invention unpatentable. As claims 2-4 and 13 are dependent on independent claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable for the same reasons as claim 1. Thus, it is further respectfully submitted that this rejection is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections, it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at 609-734-6809, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Serial No. 10/500,204

Attorney Docket No. PD010078

No fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,
Marco Winter et al.

By: /Joel M. Fogelson/
Joel M. Fogelson
Reg. No. 43,613
Tel. No. (609) 734-6809

Thomson Licensing, LLC
Patent Operations
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312
August 15, 2007